Morse Calls for More Peace Marches, P. 3

Despite Heavier Bombings and Bigger Boloney

"Saigon—The number of Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam increased sharply in September despite near-record battle losses and defections, according to American High Command estimates. Neither bombing of infiltration starting points nor sea-patroling apparently has interfered seriously with the continuing Vietcong buildup, although some of its increased strength may be due to forced recruiting* of young men in areas where guerrillas hold sway. The number of main force insurgents—those who are full-time fighters in organized units—is estimated by American intelligence sources at 80,000 an increase of 15,000 over a month ago.

"The number of part-time guerrillas—farmers by day and raiders in black pajamas by night—has increased from an estimate of 80,000 to 100,000 in August to from 100,000 to 120,000 in September. Growth of the Vietcong as learned today was in sharp contrast to the flurry of favorable numerical indicators that the enemy is losing personnel faster than ever before."

—Jack Foisie, Washington Post, Oct. 17 (abridged).

* Isn't it just barely possible that one or two might have joined up in protest against our indiscriminate slaughter?
—IFS

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIII. NO. 35 OCTOBER 25, 1965 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

If We Could Only Get Rid of Christ and Constitution

Those who remember how the Romans felt about the Christians will not be surprised that one of them should have burned his draft card. Christians have always claimed to render unto Caesar what is Caesar's, but this may be Aesopian language. Under apparent submission to authority lies encouragement to civil disobedience since the saying leaves unanswered who is to determine what is Caesar's. If each man insists that his conscience be his guide, the end result is anarchy. Thoughtful men have long recognized the peril in the Christian doctrine of the primacy of conscience. Defense counsel tried to make the West see what openings this gave Moscow but their warnings were brushed aside at the Nuremberg trial. Der Fuehrer saw the danger and wanted to replace this pacifistic religion with a more virile Germanic creed, but his efforts were frustrated by the need to placate the Papacy, which is again showing its true colors. When the Pope virtually advocates admission of Red China to the United Nations, little wonder that a devout young Catholic refuses to fight in Asia.

Most Catholics Loyal

We do not wish to suggest that Roman Catholics are not to be trusted. Most of them are loyal citizens. Their priests often preach the most invigorating sermons in wartime. But judge and jury at the trial of David J. Miller for burning his draft card must be made to see, in extenuation, that the religious doctrines to which this young man was exposed left him unfit to understand practical realities. The Church itself in the Middle Ages, by keeping the laity from reading the Gospels, acknowledged that they might have an unsettling effect on immature minds. We would be the first to protest if this led the government to take hasty action against churchgoing. But it is not without proper means for dealing with those who abuse freedom of religion. The Internal Security Act was framed to cope with the Communist menace but its provisions are general enough to cover any international movement which takes positions paralleling those of the Communists. Their members, their financial contributors, their printing presses and publications, must be disclosed to the Subversive Activities Control Board by registration. This is clearly usable against Roman Catholic pacifist groups, opposing the war in Vietnam, in concert with the Vatican.

Perhaps the Next Step Will Be to Seize Papers Which Print Lippmann at Home

"SAIGON, Oct. 17—The Saigon English-language Daily News was ordered to halt publication for five days for infringing the country's censorship laws. The newspaper was told it infringed the laws by publishing articles without first submitting them to the censor. It was understood that an article by the syndicated American columnist Walter Lippmann displeased the government. The article published Oct. 12, described the South Vietnamese army as war-weary and said it had too little morale to occupy territory that American forces seized from the Vietcong."

—Reuters, Washington Post, Oct. 18.

Next to the problem of Christians who take their Gospel too seriously is that of Americans who take the Constitution too literally. McCarthy taught us to look with suspicion on "Constitution-lovers." We must be on our guard against constitutionalist infiltration. The day before Attorney General Katzenbach spoke in Chicago of prosecutions against the student peace movement, the Associated Press asked Justice Department for comment on Senator Stennis's demand for action. "One top level lawyer" said (*Washington Star*, Oct. 16), "You just can't make a snap judgment on what you would do if someone should put out a pamphlet or make a speech exhorting others to be draft dodgers. Sure we're keeping an eye on this thing, and we know what the law is, but we also keep an eye on the First amendment." Katzenbach had better begin his investigation right in his own Department. How are we going to make Asia safe for democracy if we allow all this subversive talk about free speech?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why We Welcome and Support the Nov. 27 Peace March on Washington

We are devoting this entire issue to the peace movement because of the attempt to smear and intimidate it. The strategy of the government, as Senator Morse pointed out in a speech Oct. 19 too late for fuller discussion in this issue, is to focus on the far fringes of the movement in order to "tag all dissent as lawless, reckless and bordering on sedition." The press and TV are abetting this by their coverage. Sober speeches at peace rallies are ignored and a caricature created by emphasizing the bizarre. This is a good way to howl down honest misgiving for the moment. In the long run, it will exact a price in many spheres of public policy. We suggest a few:

Exaggerating Communist Importance

1. *The question of draft-dodgers.* This has been blown up out of all proportion in the strategy of the smear. Those who say that peace protest encourages the other side must admit that the government's own arrests also exaggerate the extent of opposition to the war. Anyone abroad who reads the alarms of Katzenbach and J. Edgar Hoover must begin to think that America's tiny and splintered Communist movement is a major force. The conservative *Baltimore Sun* protested in an editorial (Oct. 20) that an AP survey of draft boards "shows no evidence of organized draft avoidance." It sees "the vast majority" of young Americans as ready to serve as always. This pumped-up hullabaloo will end by creating more draft avoidance.

The draft law is not the only law it is illegal to obstruct. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 both carry provisions making it a crime to obstruct their enforcement. The anti-war extremists burn draft cards. The anti-equality forces burn Negro churches. The swiftness of the crackdown on one contrasts dangerously with the slow-motion on the other. The government is foolish to invite this comparison, just as it was foolish to make a young Catholic pacifist its first test case. No matter how loud the mob-like chorus of the respectable they will not drown the still small voice of conscience. This *is* a cruel, a barbarous, an immoral and an illegal war. If our country were attacked, few would oppose the call to arms in its defense; it is not lack of patriotism, on the contrary it is concern for the good name and better traditions of our country which leads so many to protest this distant and dubious conflict.

Ruby Dee's Questions

"When I've listened to the President talk about the war in Vietnam—its value to peace and freedom—he has seemed so earnest and sounded so sincere that I've found myself waiting for that great reason, that perhaps I had not heard, that reason that truly justifies the slaughter of men—in the name of peace and freedom and in the name of God. So many questions come to mind: when has war brought peace on earth? Can we truly deny that wars are primarily fought for pride and power? Has not our country emerged from each war richer and more powerful? Are not, primarily, the darker peoples of the earth subjected and exploited through war? Will we ever fight the white people in South Africa, for a major example, to free the Africans so shamelessly wronged? Oppression now exists in South Africa mostly because the British and American interests support it in apartheid. Can we really care about the Koreans, the Vietnamese or other colored people on this earth, when in fact, were they on our land we would discriminate, segregate and force them to suffer in life-consuming fashion for their non-whiteness?—*Ruby Dee, March on Washington press conference, Oct. 18.*

2. *The need for a peace movement.* Congressman George E. Brown (*D. Cal.*) made an important point at the poorly covered press conference announcing the Nov. 27 peace March on Washington. I made the same point in my talk at the New York demonstration the previous Saturday. When the time comes for negotiation, as I hope and believe it will, the Administration in power will need support. There is also need for a counter-balancing force left of center to hold off the rising chorus on the right for unrestricted bombing of North Vietnam and even of China. It is foolish for the government to lock itself in with a monolithic opinion which will make negotiation and restraint impossible. If the peace movement provides a false picture of majority opinion it does so in a way which gives the U.S. a propaganda dividend. It makes the American people look more concerned, more humane, more free and more courageous than they are.

3. *Military vs. civilian control.* The Pentagon's forte always was publicity. The military is at its best in its press releases. Its vast propaganda machine is at work spreading

Notre Dame Faculty Member Gives A Catholic's View of the Coming Peace March

"I speak as a Catholic, not for all Catholics, but as a man and a Catholic. Less than two weeks ago, Pope Paul in his magnificent address before the UN praised and, in a sense, consecrated that body of nations. He urged a renewal of spirit among men, an abandonment of national pride, an effort to embrace all nations including those outside the UN (China). As a follower of Paul (as indeed many are in spirit if not in fact), I look for a magnanimous response from my own country and do not find it from government spokesmen. The monotonous movement of bombers scorching the Asian earth continues. The draft is increased, the old argument about China's entry into the UN are increased.

"If I believe Paul's words, and I do, I cannot be silent now. Now when generosity is expected, a hardness of spirit obtains. Now when an appeal to our common origin and common destiny as men is made, a relentless cry of national interests and closure of all discussion deafens us. I find a drift toward a brutality of mind and action among our nation's leaders that must filter down to the people. I do not say that conversely the North Vietnamese or the Viet Cong are moral—but their immorality does not justify ours. I appeal to people of good conscience to act on the call of their conscience. It is a moral obligation to bear witness to the cause of peace. The United States must make great efforts, particularly through the UN, to negotiate. It must manifest its generous and adaptable proper frame of mind by ceasing its bombing-missions, and its cutting off of the build-up of truth. That I regard as a moral imperative to be urged by those who take part in the Peace March and Rally."

—Joseph M. Duffy, Jr., Associate Professor of English at Notre Dame, at peace march press conference, Oct. 18.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the military bureaucracy as Stennis of Mississippi in his last the delusion of victory by attrition, though a Senator as close letter to constituents spoke of a 15-year effort in Vietnam. Russell of Georgia advanced a curious argument Oct. 18 against the peace movement. He said he was one of those who opposed our involvement in this conflict but that now "flag", "honor" and "prestige" were at stake. This is the usual way the military trap their countries into disastrous wars to cover up past mistakes. How far do we follow this route? Into war with China?

The Warnings of Our Soldier Presidents

Eisenhower objected to the peace rallies. But he himself a few weeks earlier contradicted Johnson and said our commitment in South Vietnam was only one of aid and supplies. It is time to remember that our two greatest military presidents, Washington and Eisenhower, both warned us in their farewell addresses against undue military influence, the latter against the military-industrial complex, the former against "overgrown military establishments" as a menace to liberty.

Every major military figure from MacArthur down has warned us against ever again getting involved in a land war in Asia; Eisenhower decided against it when he was in the White House, but there we are. Every thoughtful soldier we have sent to Vietnam since the Taylor mission in 1961 has stressed the need for political and social reform to quell the rebellion. The rebellion has grown because we have weakly acquiesced in the refusal of our puppets to give the people greater liberty. Now we are impelled to restrict liberty at home as well as in Vietnam to carry on this unpopular war.

4. *The pretense of democracy.* A vast expansion of the war effort has been covered by a smoke-screen of peace talk. Now that we have a situation of strength high officials (like Rusk at Johns Hopkins in an answer to a question Oct. 16) imply that we must fight the war through to complete victory.* This is the line of least resistance because many would rather go on killing people, ours and theirs, rather than allow the popular will in South Vietnam to express itself if that should mean a coalition with the National Liberation Front. The Administration which, through Thomas Mann, opposes any alliance with the Communists in Latin America is hardly likely to negotiate a coalition with them in Vietnam unless greater public understanding and protest is aroused. We'd rather leave a lot more of our boys dead than allow South Vietnam to be a little red, even if that is what its people prefer to the burning up of their country by our bombers.

So we welcome the March on Washington scheduled for Nov. 27. On these pages and the next we offer the text of some sober statements explaining it. A distinguished list from Norman Thomas to Saul Bellow support it. It will seek not civil disobedience but persuasion. Last week-end's nationwide protests discomfited the "hawks" by their size and support. The March must not be a failure. To join it is to help save human life and perhaps our own freedom. As war fever rises, the fools and the cowards are always hailed as patriots while those who urge reflection are howled down as subversive. Which is the greater patriotism? To run with the pack? Or to urge at some personal risk what one believes the wiser course for one's country?

*** Mansfield in the Senate Oct. 19 protested the off-the-record interview which gave rise to a rash of such stories last week. "Many Washington newsmen," Murray Marder wrote in the Washington Post Oct. 20, "did know the original source, who happened to be a very high official indeed."**

Appealing to A Red Cross We Ignored

"The editorial in the New York Times of Oct 1 errs when it blames the Vietcong and North Vietnam of unilaterally violating the Geneva conventions. The Vietcong fighters are as protected by the Geneva conventions as the American GIs are. Dramatic protests against violations of the Geneva Conventions should have been made when the first Vietcong prisoners were shot, when they were tortured, when the American army started to destroy Vietcong hospitals and to cut off medical supply. If the North Vietnamese shoot some American prisoners now, then this is the result of a long series of breaches of the Geneva rules committed by the Americans and South Vietnamese. It is utterly hypocritical to condone wholesale violations of the Red Cross principles on one side and protest reprisals against them.

"The shooting of the two fliers and the menacing trials of other American prisoners may be tragic but if they help to stop the wholesale murder of Vietcong prisoners, the tortures, the bombing raids against hospitals and villages and all the inhuman rest and bring about respect for Red Cross rules in all cases, then they will have been useful."

—Hans Henle, former member of the information service, International Committee of the Red Cross, Geneva, (abr.) in New York Times *(international edition only) Oct. 14.*

Morse Tells Senate U.S. Needs to Hear The Tramp of Marching Feet in Protest

"I made this long speech today because tomorrow in various parts of the country various groups of varied political complexion are going to protest America's involvement in war in Vietnam. I certainly do not endorse all the views and the conduct that may be taken by some of these groups. Neither do I endorse the McCarthyism of the superpatriots and shocking rightists in this country who are already charging those who tomorrow will protest outlawry of the United States in Asia as being traitors. Short of a declaration of war what is needed in this country is the protests of millions of Americans against the policy of their Government in Asia.

"What is needed in America, short of a declaration of war is the tramp, tramp, tramp of marching feet in the communities of America, of free people protesting; nonviolent demonstrations against the course of action of the United States in violation of both the Constitution and our treaty obligations. Mr. President, there are those who would silence those of us who are there to protest the outlawry of our Government. There are those, even in this body, who believe some sort of censorship ought to be placed on free men who practice their freedom by protesting the inexcusable foreign policy of the Johnson administration. I thank my God that there are in this country thousands of people who will be heard from tomorrow and in the weeks and months ahead and who will not be cowed into submission by the intolerant bigots of America who believe that because our country is on an illegal course of action, we must support its illegality."

—Wayne Morse (D. Oregon) in the Senate Oct. 15.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Purpose of Nov. 27 March on Washington Explained in Statement Press Ignored

U.S. Brushed Off Peace Feeler From Hanoi During Bombing Lull Last May

By Sanford Gottlieb

Coordinator of the Nov. 27th March on Washington

We are here today to explain why we feel compelled to organize a March on Washington for Peace in Vietnam. In the words of the distinguished Americans who are sponsors of this March, "We see no gain coming from the war in Vietnam. We see only the victimization of the Vietnamese people, the erosion of a better society at home, and the clear possibility of a world conflict."

Danger of A New McCarthyism

As the war continues, we believe the administration will inevitably turn its resources and energies toward the military conflict and away from its fledgling programs to eradicate racial injustice and poverty at home. Moreover, as mindless chauvinism takes hold and public frustration mounts along with the casualty lists we expect many of our fellow citizens to be caught up in a new search for scapegoats—a new wave of McCarthyism. The early signs are already there: the denunciation of the protest movement as "Communist-led"; the cries for action against opponents of the draft; the refusal by some local authorities to grant permission to hold parades or even to use public buildings for a two-sided debate of the issues.

We seek to end this war. We affirm that no party to the conflict, the U.S. included has done all it can to bring about negotiations, and since the war will ultimately end at the conference table, we ask new actions to speed that day. These new actions must be designed to show military restraint, not military escalation. We disagree with the administration's assumption that added military pressure will bring the North Vietnamese to the conference table. No proud nation—and the regime in Hanoi represents the only Asian people in modern times to win its independence by militarily defeating a Western colonial power—will talk peace as the result of aerial bombardment.

We now question whether the Administration is interested in negotiations. A new mood in Washington, produced no doubt by the first American victories in South Vietnam, is exemplified by this report in the *Washington Post* of October 16: "The Capital talks less of peace by negotiation and it is unanimously thankful that Hanoi did not opt for the conference table last winter when disaster, it is belatedly conceded, was on the military horizon." In point of fact, Hanoi did opt for talks proposed by U.N. Secretary General U Thant in February, while the U.S. refused. Furthermore, we now have confirmation from the State Department and the U.S. Mission to the U.N., that, the day before the end of the six-day pause in the bombings of North Vietnam in May, the French government was approached by the North Vietnamese representative in Paris with the request that the following message be transmitted to Washington: *Hanoi was prepared to negotiate on the basis of the four points proposed by its foreign minister in April.* According to some versions of this report, Hanoi specified that it was not demanding the prior withdrawal of U.S. troops. I was told in the State Department that this message was indeed received in Washington, but it was not the kind of message we were looking for. The Administration did not investigate further; it resumed the bombings.

We can only wonder what kind of message Washington is looking for. And we can organize, as concerned citizens, to help Washington give and receive the proper signals before South Vietnam is transformed into a funeral pyre. In so doing, we believe that we are not damaging the morale of American troops in Vietnam, but trying to bring the war to an end before more of our people are killed. We are convinced that we speak for many Americans, including great numbers of those now included in the broad but shallow consensus behind the President, who feel in their hearts that the burning of villages by napalm and artillery fire is not the way to preserve freedom or to promote the dignity of the individual.

So Two Were Well Enough to Protest

"The President's pastor, the Rev. George R. Davis of National City Christian Church, yesterday denounced demonstrations against America's fighting in Vietnam as 'disgraceful.' 'The violation of law and disregard of responsibility' in Saturday's demonstrations 'are no guarantee of the future,' he declared. 'Anarchy is not the way to democracy.' Dr. Davis said the demonstrations did not reflect the general feeling of either civilians or military. He had been told, he said, that no complaints have been heard from wounded soldiers at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, 'except from two men who were the least hurt.'"

—Washington Post, Oct. 18 (abridged).

Extra Copies This Issue Available in Bulk at Penny Apiece Plus Postage

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

10/25/65

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED